

**MOUNTAIN VIEW SMALL AREA PLAN  
OPTION 2  
REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1) ***Affordability.*** Concerns were raised that the plan does not provide for a balance of housing choices especially affordable housing and starter housing stock.

*Current policies in the plan which address this issue:*

- a. Smaller lot sizes are allowed in the high density area where public water and/or sewer is available which allows for lower costs of land and infrastructure (LU-2);
- b. Approximately 45% of the district allows for manufactured housing (H-6 and Map 9);
- c. The extension of water and sewer services is encouraged in the high density area which allows for lower development costs (Section III: P-7 and CF-14);

*Recommended amendment to the plan:*

Add the following recommendation to Section IV: Housing:

**H-9      Allow density bonuses to developers when they provide starter housing stock in residential and mix-used developments.**

- 2) ***Corridor Enhancement.*** Develop tools to ensure the beautification of the area's corridors and highly traveled roadways. These tools could be considered by the Board to address a county-wide beautification program.

*Current policies in the plan which address this issue:*

- a. Residential developments should incorporate landscaping, buffers and/or berms into the development design. Also uniform subdivision marker signs should be developed (LU-6).

*Recommended amendment to the plan:*

Amend the recommendation in Section I: Land Use & Community Design to read:

**LU-6      Residential subdivisions should incorporate the following additional design criteria:**

- .1      Landscaping, limited driveways, road setbacks, buffers and/or berms that promote privacy, aesthetics and the scenic character of a new residential subdivision.**

Add the following recommendation to Section II: Transportation:

**T-31      Establish “gateway” improvements in the area which may include landscaping and welcome signs. Funding for these improvements may come from Federal or State grants.**

- 3) ***Mixed Uses.*** The plan needs to allow a mixture of residential, commercial and office uses in a planned development setting.

*Current policies in the plan which address this issue:*

- a. The Hwy. 321 corridor allows for a mixture of residential, commercial and office uses in the areas currently zoned 321-ED(MX) at the River Road interchange (LU-16);
- b. Live/work units are encouraged in the rural commercial nodes at Advent’s Crossroads and Propst Crossroads (LU-11);

*Recommended amendments to the plan:*

Amend the following recommendations in Section I: Land Use & Community Design to read:

**LU-15      Establish a ~~commercial-mixed use~~ overlay district along a segment of NC Highway 127, as shown on Map 6...**

**LU-17      Direct office-institutional uses to the US Highway 321 Corridor and River Road interchange and NC Highway 127 overlay district, as shown on Map 6.**

Also amend Section V: Economic Development to read:

**ED-1      Designate a ~~commercial-mixed use~~ corridor along NC Highway 127, as shown on Map 6...**

- 4) ***Residential Densities.*** There were concerns that the plan did not have enough areas designated as high density and that there was not enough density types with only two districts being presented: high density at ½ acre lots and low density at 2 acre lots. Two options are presented below to address these concerns:

**Alternative A:** The first option would be to allow increased density where public water and/or sewer lines are located. To allow this, Map 5: MVSAP Proposed Density Districts would be revised as indicated on the enclosed **Map 5A**. This maps shows the average density of 3.0 units per acre (or 15,000 square foot lots) along a ½ mile wide road corridor where waterlines are installed. These roads include NC Highway 127, NC Highway 10, Old Shelby Road, Mountain Grove Road and Finger Bridge Road. Also a future high density district is created for the Advents Crossroads area where future waterlines are being proposed. This

would allow an average residential density of 3.0 units per acre when the waterline is installed. Another amendment on this map is to allow a high density area which is bounded by Old Shelby Road on the west and Mountain Grove Road on the south. This area abuts an existing high density area and will be impacted by the Southern Corridor and the new I-40 interchange at W. 33<sup>rd</sup> Street in Longview.

An additional amendment to be considered is the encouragement of alternative subdivision designs in the low density area. The plan currently recommends that open space/cluster subdivisions be required in the low density area unless they incorporate buffers around the development. To encourage additional preservation of open space, the plan could allow density bonuses for additional open space preserved above the current requirement of 30%.

In addition to the adopting the new Map 5A, an amendment to the plan's principles would be made.

*Recommended amendment to the plan:*

- a. Delete Section III: Community Facilities and Public Services Guiding Principle P-8 which reads:

“Preserve rural character by controlling density whether water and sewer services are available.”

- b. Amend the low density recommendation in LU-5 to include an incentive for providing more open space in development:

**LU-5 Lower density residential areas should meet the following development requirements:**

- .1 Cluster development is required with open space preserved along the road frontage unless a traditional subdivision design is developed that can incorporate open space preservation and buffers around the development. Density bonuses will be offered for development which provide additional open space above the minimum 30% requirement.**

**Alternative B:** The second option would create a medium density district in addition to the changes in the high density areas noted in Option A. There would be a medium residential district designated which would allow for an average of one dwelling unit per acre. **Map 5B** shows the medium density district which is bounded on the south by NC Hwy. 10, on the west by NC Hwy. 127 and the east by the high density district along the US Hwy. 321 corridor. The past development patterns indicate that this area has been growing and that waterline extensions into this area is a possibility in the future. In order to preserve the rural character of this area, corridor standards for subdivision as indicated in “Corridor Enhancement” section will be required.

In addition to adopting the new Map 5B, an amendment to the plan's recommendations would be made.

*Recommended amendments to the plan:*

- a. Add to Section I: Land Use & Community Facilities

**LU-26     Designate an area for medium density residential uses, as shown on Map 5B.**

**LU-27     Medium density residential developments should adhere to the following design concepts:**

- .1         Single-family homes should be developed at a density of 1 unit per acre.**
- .2         To encourage cluster subdivisions in this district, density bonuses will be provided.**

- 5) ***Bakers Mountain Protection District.*** There were concerns from property owners over the five-acre lot size requirement on Bakers Mountain. Staff has met several times with one of the largest property owners to discuss the mountain protection district. In the discussions, it was agreed that the mountain was a valuable but sensitive asset to the community. There was also a desire to allow for development which would be designed to minimize its' impacts on the mountain. With this in mind, the following recommendations are made.

A new planned development section in the Zoning Ordinance would be created. Any new major subdivision proposals within the Bakers Mountain Protection District would be required to meet the planned development standards. The base zoning would remain two acres like the surrounding area with the option of allowing the developer to transfer the density from steep slopes to less sensitive areas. Lot owners would be restricted in how much area they can clear on the lot based on the slope of the surrounding land. This would allow minimal clearing on extreme slopes so to minimize erosion on the mountain. Building height limits would also be included in the ordinance. In order to address the compatibility of building materials of the homes, the ordinance would state that the home's architecture and finishes must blend with the natural environment.

Revisions to the plan's recommendations would be made to accomplish this proposal:

*Recommended amendments to the plan:*

- a. Delete NR-2 which calls for a moratorium for development on Bakers Mountain.
- b. Delete NR-4 which recommends lobbying State legislators to adopt a bill to prohibit clear-cutting on the mountain.
- c. Delete NR-8 which recommends prohibiting clear cutting.

d. Amend NR-3 to read as follows:

**NR-3     ~~Limit~~ Establish standards for new development on Bakers Mountain above the 1100 feet in the area designated as “Mountain Protection” on Map 7. All new major subdivisions will be subject to a planned development process which will address the following:**

- .1     lot clearing limits based on percent slope**
- .2     height restrictions**
- .3     building materials and finishes of homes and signage to be compatible with the natural environment**
- 4.     environmentally sensitive road and lot configurations**

**The average density allowable is one unit per two acres. To minimize the impacts to environmentally sensitive areas, the transferring of densities within the development will be strongly encouraged.**

The Board may consider all of Option 2 in its entirety or chose any components to address the issues and concerns raised at the public hearings and their one-on-one meetings with staff.